

Remarks

Claims 2 and 16-35 are currently pending in the Application and Claims 36-37 are newly presented herein.

Specification amendment

The response amends page 3, line 28 to page 4, line 5 of the specification. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 4 and 5 of the specification.

Claim amendments

This response amends Claims 16, 22-23, 26 and 29 to clarify the scope of the invention. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 3-5 and 8 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

New Claims

This response adds new claims 36-37 to more completely claim the invention. The new claims are **not** offered in response to the Examiner's rejections. Support for the new Claims 36-37 can be found in Figures 3 and 5 and the corresponding portions of the specification.

35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection

Claims 2 and 16-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants submit Claims 16 and 26 have been amended to clarify the scope of the invention and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection

Claims 2 and 16-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,478,275). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is reminded that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co, of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner is also reminded that “[the] identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants submit that Huang does not teach each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

Claim 16

Applicants submit that Huang does not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by amended Claim 16 of the present application:

“the flat display stands on a surface by way of the main body and the first stand **both contacting the surface** when the second stand is detached from the first stand” (emphasis added)

According to Huang, an arm “30” supports an object “60” on a table “99” through a base “10” See Figure 4 of Huang. Huang does not disclose the arm “30” supporting the object “60” on the table “99” without the base “10.” Huang also does not disclose the object “60” contacting the table “99.” Therefore, Huang does not teach, disclose or suggest “the flat display stands on a surface by way of the main body and the first stand both contacting the surface when the second stand is detached from the first stand” as recited in amended Claim 16.

Hence, Claim 16 is patentable over Huang and should be allowed by the

Examiner. Claims 2, 17-25 and 37, at least based on their dependency on Claim 16, are also believed to be patentable over Huang.

Claim 26

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Huang does not teach, disclose or suggest “wherein, the flat display stands on a surface by way of the main body and the first stand both contacting the surface when the second stand is detached from the first stand” as recited in amended Claim 26. Hence, Claim 26 is patentable over Huang and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 27-36, at least based on their dependency on Claim 26, are also believed to be patentable over Huang.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents POB 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 23, 2005

(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp

(Name of Person Signing)

Susan Papp

(Signature)

September 23, 2005

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Popa

Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300

Encls:

Fee for the excess claims;

Post card.